

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.			
09/733,788 12/07/2000		Joshua I. Pine	00CXT0433I	2571			
25700	7590	04/18/2006		EXAMINER			
FARJAMI			HENN, TIMOTHY J				
26522 LA A MISSIÓN V		A AVENUE, SUITE A 92691	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	-200, 01		2622				
			DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	-	Application	n No.	Applicant(s)						
		09/733,78		PINE, JOSHUA 1.						
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit						
		Timothy J.	Henn	2622						
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap r Reply	opears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPIDENCE IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF TH .136(a). In no eve d will apply and wil tte, cause the appli	IS COMMUNICATION nt, however, may a reply be tim expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONEI	L. the mailing date of this commons. (35 U.S.C. § 133).						
Status										
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02</u>	February 200	<u>6</u> .		•					
'—	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.									
3) 🗌										
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Dispositi	on of Claims									
4) 🖾	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,5-9,16,18-20 and 24-27</u> is/are pending in the application.									
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.									
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.										
•	☑ Claim(s) <u>1,5-9,16,18-20 and 24-27</u> is/are rejected.									
• —										
8)	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.									
Applicati	on Papers									
, —	The specification is objected to by the Examir									
10)🛛	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 December 2000</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.									
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.										
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119									
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 										
Attachmen										
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da							
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-946) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	8)	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		O-152)					

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 5-9, 16, 18-20 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingetsu et al. (US 6,181,379) in view of Kihara et al. (US 2001/0009438 A1) in view of Kutaragi (US 4,584,598).

[claim 1]

In regard to claim 1, note that Kingetsu discloses a color imaging system comprising (Figure 1): a color imager having a plurality of photocells producing electrical responses that correspond to chromatic intensity values (Figure 1, Item 11), and the electrical responses from the plurality of photocells together comprising a captured color image (c. 2, II. 39-60); and an image processor that determines whether the captured image is substantially achromatic (c. 11, 44-61), and if so, renders each of the electrical responses as an achromatic luminance value (c. 12, II. 1-17). However, Kingetsu does not disclose a white balance function.

Page 3

Art Unit: 2622

Kihara discloses an imaging device which includes amplifiers (Figure 2, Items 13R, 13G and 13B) connected to the outputs of red, green and blue CCDs which make adjustments to the output signals in order to obtain correct black and white levels (Paragraph 0044). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include amplifiers for the red, green and blue CCDs of Kingetsu to obtain correct black and white levels (i.e. white balance the image). The examiner notes that in the combination of Kingetsu and Kihara the image is white balanced by multiplying each of the red, green and blue values by white balance coefficients (i.e. gain value of the amplifiers 13R, 13G and 13B) without interpolating the values. The white balanced image would then be subject to the processing described by Kingetsu after being converted to digital through A/D converter 110. However, Kingetsu in view of Kihara does not teach the use of white balance coefficients which are based on lighting conditions.

Kutaragi discloses that white balance parameters can be selected based on the lighting conditions in which a scene is being photographed (c. 1, II. 12-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select white balance parameters based on the light source in which a scene is being photographed as taught by Kutaragi to obtain properly white balanced images in multiple different lighting conditions.

[claim 5]

In regard to claim 5, note that Kingetsu discloses a color imaging system wherein the image processor is further configured to determine whether the white-balanced

Art Unit: 2622

image is substantially black and white and if so the image processor converts each of the chromatic intensity values as a black and white luminance value (c. 11, l. 44 - c. 12, l. 10).

[claim 6]

In regard to claim 6, note that Kingetsu discloses a color imager which is a scanner (i.e. scanning type imager; c. 2, II. 49-60). Therefore, it can be seen that Kingetsu lacks a constant, known light source. However, it is notoriously well known in the art to include constant, known light sources on cameras in the form of flashes in order to illuminate weakly lit scenes (Official Notice). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a flash in the camera of Kingetsu to be able to illuminate weakly lit scenes.

[claim 7]

In regard to claim 7, note that Kingetsu discloses a color imaging system wherein the color image capture device and image processing circuitry are disposed within a single device (Figures 1 and 2).

[claim 8]

Regarding claim 8, Kutaragi teaches a switch while allows a user to select from among a plurality of different lighting conditions (i.e. white-balance settings; c. 1, II. 12-48).

[claim 9]

Regarding claim 9, Kingetsu lacks an image-type specification control that allows a user to select from among a plurality of image formats that determines how the image

Art Unit: 2622

processor converts the white-balanced color image. Official Notice is taken that it is notoriously well known in the art to allow the user to select from a plurality of resolutions in which to save the captured image to allow more low resolution images or fewer high resolution images to be stored. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an image-type specification control in the camera to allow the user to specify the desired resolution at which the images will be stored.

[claim 16]

In regard to claim 16, see claim 1.

[claim 18]

In regard to claim 18, note that Kingetsu discloses detecting whether the image is a substantially black-and-white image, and if the image is detected to be a substantially black-and-white image, converting the plurality of chromatic intensity values to a plurality of black and white values (c. 12, II. 1-10).

[claim 19]

In regard to claim 19, note that Kingetsu discloses all limitations except for steps of computing mean and standard deviation values of a color saturation distribution of the image, and comparing the mean and standard deviation values to a plurality of threshold values to detect whether the image is substantially gray scale. However, it is well known in the art to determine whether an image is substantially achromatic to comparing statistical values such as the mean and standard deviation with threshold values to quickly and easily determine if an image is color or achromatic (Official

Application/Control Number: 09/733,788 Page 6

Art Unit: 2622

Notice). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compare statistical values of the image data to determine if the image is achromatic in the achromatic image determination step of Kingetsu.

[claim 20]

In regard to claim 20, note that Kingetsu discloses all limitations except for steps of computing mean and standard deviation values of a luminance distribution of the image, and comparing the mean and standard deviation values to a plurality of threshold values to detect whether the image is a substantially black and white image. However, it is well known in the art to determine whether an image is substantially black and white to comparing statistical values such as the mean and standard deviation with threshold values to quickly and easily determine if an image is color or black and white (Official Notice). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compare statistical values of the image data to determine if the image is achromatic in the black and white image determination step of Kingetsu.

[claims 24 and 26]

Regarding claims 24 and 26, Kutaragi teaches lighting conditions which include overcast sky (i.e. cloudy), fluorescent bulb, direct sunlight and incandescent bulb (c. 1, II. 23-28).

[claims 25 and 27

Application/Control Number: 09/733,788 Page 7

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claims 25 and 27, Kutaragi discloses sampling the a color space (i.e. with sensors 25 and 26) and applying an error minimization formula (i.e. properly selecting the white balance parameters which will produce the smallest error when applied to the captured image from the set of predefined white balance parameters; Figure 5B).

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy J. Henn whose telephone number is (571) 272-7310. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 AM - 6:00 PM.

Application/Control Number: 09/733,788 Page 8

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TJH 4/15/2006

TUAN HO PRIMARY EXAMINER